

Policy Analysis

Community vulnerability to health impacts of wildland fire smoke exposure

Ana G. Rappold, Jeanette M. Reyes, George Pouliot, Wayne E. Cascio, and David Diaz-Sanchez

Environ. Sci. Technol., **Just Accepted Manuscript** • Publication Date (Web): 11 May 2017

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on May 15, 2017

Just Accepted

"Just Accepted" manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides "Just Accepted" as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. "Just Accepted" manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. "Just Accepted" manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). "Just Accepted" is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the "Just Accepted" Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the "Just Accepted" Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these "Just Accepted" manuscripts.

Community vulnerability to health impacts of wildland fire smoke exposure

Running title: Community health-vulnerability to fire smoke

Authors:

Ana G. Rappold*, PhD, United States Environmental Protection Agency / National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory / Environmental Public Health Division, NC

Jeanette Reyes PhD, United States Environmental Protection Agency / National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory / Environmental Public Health Division, NC

George Pouliot, United States Environmental Protection Agency / National Exposure Research Laboratory /Computational Exposure Division, NC

Wayne E. Cascio, MD, United States Environmental Protection Agency / National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory / Environmental Public Health Division, NC

David Diaz-Sanchez, PhD, United States Environmental Protection Agency / National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory / Environmental Public Health Division, NC


Corresponding author:

(*) Ana G. Rappold
Statistician, PhD
109 T.W. Alexander Drive
US EPA
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
919 843 9504
rappold.ana@epa.gov

Data Attribution and Disclaimers:

Disclaimer: The research described in this article has been reviewed by the National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Agency, nor does the mention of trade names of commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

34 TOC Graphic



35

36

ABSTRACT

Identifying communities vulnerable to adverse health effects from exposure to wildfire smoke may help prepare responses, increase the resilience to smoke and improve public health outcomes during smoke days. We developed a Community Health-Vulnerability Index (CHVI) based on factors known to increase the risks of health effects from air pollution and wildfire smoke exposures. These factors included county prevalence rates for asthma in children and adults, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, hypertension, diabetes, obesity, percent of population 65 years of age and older, and indicators of socioeconomic status including poverty, education, income and unemployment. Using air quality simulated for the period between 2008 and 2012 over the continental U.S. we also characterized the population size at risk with respect to the level and duration of exposure to fire-originated fine particulate matter (fire-PM_{2.5}) and CHVI. We estimate that 10% of the population (30.5 million) lived in the areas where the contribution of fire-PM_{2.5} to annual average ambient PM_{2.5} was high (>1.5 µg/m³) and that 10.3 million individuals experienced unhealthy air quality levels for more than 10 days due to smoke. Using CHVI we identified the most vulnerable counties and determined that these communities experience more smoke exposures in comparison to less vulnerable communities.

INTRODUCTION

Exposure to wildfire smoke is a serious health risk which can disproportionately impact sensitive groups. A number of studies have shown an association between smoke exposure and worsening of respiratory symptoms, increased rates of cardiorespiratory emergency visits, hospitalizations, and even death ¹⁻¹². Identifying communities vulnerable to adverse health outcomes during smoke days can provide valuable information for local, state and federal governments and non-governmental organizations to prioritize public health actions and improve public health outcomes on fire-smoke days.

Among the pollutants found in smoke, fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) is of the highest concern to health. In the most recent synthesis and evaluation of scientific literature on the health effects of air pollution, the Integrated Science Assessment (ISA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ¹³ concluded that the weight of scientific evidence suggests a causal relationship between short- and long-term exposures and cardiovascular effects and mortality, and a likely causal relationship with respiratory effects. ISA is a comprehensive review of the health and ecological effects caused by air pollutants, mandated by the Clean Air Act, and provides the scientific basis for review of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Multiple studies demonstrate that the health impacts from PM_{2.5} exposures are disproportionately shared by individuals in the sensitive groups ^{14, 15}. The most sensitive groups include children, the aged, and pregnant women, as well as those with a pre-existing cardiopulmonary disease. Individuals and communities of lower socioeconomic status, and those with other pre-existing chronic inflammatory conditions are also considered at higher risk. Distribution of sensitive populations defines

the vulnerability to adverse health effects across communities and reducing impacts among these populations is likely to bring the greatest public health burden benefit on smoke days.

Population vulnerability to various natural hazards has been studied for decades, however population vulnerability to smoke has not been well documented. Various aspects of population vulnerability have been examined in the context of heat waves¹⁶, famine, seismic events, coastal and inland floods, sea level rise, and drought¹⁷⁻²⁰. Recent assessments have also focused on identifying communities vulnerable to environmental hazards exacerbated by climate change^{19, 21, 22}. The purpose of assessing population vulnerability is to determine the population at greatest risk to environmental hazards, understand how communities respond and adapt and inform ways to mitigate the risk and negative impacts²³. The communities that adapt to and recover after a disaster are those that can better plan, prepare and respond to environmental hazards. The alarming trends in the severity of wildland fires and growth of populations in the communities adjacent to wildlands call for an improved understanding of which communities are the most vulnerable to health impacts in order to improve public health response.

Here, we index community vulnerability to health effects of air pollution and wildfire smoke, based on previously studied clinical and social risk-factors that were found to modify the association between air pollution and adverse health outcomes. We then quantify population size at risk with respect to the levels of the index and the level and duration of smoke exposure in the recent past. To characterize smoke exposure in the recent past we simulated fire-originating fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) over a five-year period (2008-2012) using a chemical transport modeling system. The objective of this work is to demonstrate that

community health vulnerability can be readily assessed using existing data and to provide motivation as to why it may be necessary. Understanding where the most vulnerable communities are found can be useful in developing outreach and education material.

METHODS AND DATA

Development of Community health-vulnerability Index

To develop an index of community health-vulnerability to the adverse health effects of smoke exposures, we obtained specific socio-economic, demographic, and health outcome measures previously determined in the literature to modify the risk of air pollution related health outcomes ^{13, 24, 25}. More specifically, we obtained county prevalence for diabetes, hypertension, adult and pediatric asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD); percent of population over 65 years of age, household income, education, rates of poverty, and unemployment. In the PM_{2.5}- Integrated Science Assessment ¹³, both intrinsic (disease status) and extrinsic factors (poverty) are referred to as factors of susceptibility and vulnerability respectively. However, because all of the factors are aggregated and not individual data, we use the term ‘vulnerability’ throughout to define increased risk of adverse health outcomes related to exposure. In all cases we used county level indicators available across the continental U.S. because mitigation and adaptation plans are often planned and executed at the county units. The list of variables used to profile vulnerability is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather representative of the key clinical and social conditions known to or suspected to increase the risk of adverse health outcomes associated with fire- PM_{2.5}. Data sources and summary statistics are available in Supplemental Material Table S1.

123 Prevalence and incidence estimates of pediatric asthma (in children <18 years of age),
124 adult asthma (18+ years of age), and adult COPD (30+) which includes chronic bronchitis
125 and emphysema, were obtained from the American Lung Association ²⁶. American Lung
126 Association projected national and state prevalence of chronic lung disease to county
127 levels using the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System ²⁷ a phone based survey system
128 that has been collecting data continuously since 2004, and statistical methods developed by
129 US Census Bureau.

130 We used county level prevalence of hypertension to approximate prevalence of
131 cardiovascular disease. We used sex specific and age adjusted hypertension prevalence
132 data in adults over 30 years of age reported in Olives et al. ²⁸. The study characterized the
133 relationship between self-reported and physical measurements of hypertension reported
134 in the National Health Examination and Nutrition Survey and used the relationship to
135 adjust BRFSS 2009 self-reported responses on hypertension prevalence (among all
136 respondents, percentage of those who reported systolic BP of at least 140mm Hg and/or
137 self-reported taking medication) for self-reporting bias. Prevalence for county-level age,
138 race, and sex adjusted estimates of diagnosed diabetes and obesity in adults (20 years of
139 age and older) were obtained from BRFSS 2012 from
140 http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/atlas/countyrank/County_ListofIndicators.html.

141 Older adults and individuals of lower socio-economic status have been shown to be of
142 increased risk of cardiovascular and respiratory effects in both short-term exposure
143 studies and long-term exposure studies of air pollution ¹³. Similarly, several studies found
144 that socio-economic factors also modified health responses during the exposures to

wildfire smoke^{29,30}. Socioeconomic and demographic profiles used in this study were taken from 2010 U.S. Census including population size by age group and gender, percent of individuals living in poverty, percent of families living in poverty, median household income, and percent of unemployment.

We used principal components analysis and varimax rotation to reduce the number of measures of vulnerability into a smaller number of independent components. All measures of vulnerability were standardized prior to analysis. The first five components explained 84% of variance and were highly loaded on: 1) economic deprivation, 2) population of 65 years and older, 3) chronic adult respiratory conditions (COPD and asthma), 4) pre-existing conditions linked to hypertension, obesity and diabetes and 5) pediatric asthma (Supplemental Material Table S2). All five components were positively associated with primary measures, with the exception of median household income that was negatively loaded on the first component measuring economic deprivation (Supplemental Material Figure S11). The higher scores of all five components described the more vulnerable state (more poverty, more individuals 65 years and older, more chronic respiratory and other conditions). The five components were individually assigned quintile scores (1(the least vulnerable) - 5 (the most vulnerable)). Quintile ranks for each component were added together to create overall Community Health-Vulnerability Index (CHVI) with higher values defining more vulnerable states.

Air Quality Simulations

We simulated daily air quality from 2008 to 2012 using the Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) model with and without wildland and prescribed fires. The calculated

difference between the two model runs represents the contribution of fire emissions to the ambient PM_{2.5} levels (fire-PM_{2.5}). Inputs to the model included gridded meteorological fields, emissions data, and boundary conditions. For a regional or continental CMAQ model simulation, the meteorological fields were provided by annual CONUS Weather Research and Forecasting model (WRF) simulation that utilized 12 km horizontal grid spacing and 35 vertical layers of variable thickness extending up to 50 hPa, with the top of the lowest model layer at approximately 20 m above ground level. Initial and boundary conditions for WRF were provided by the North American Mesoscale Model available from the National Centers for Environmental Prediction. The input emissions were based on a 12 km national U.S. domain with speciation for the Carbon-Bond 05 chemical mechanism³². The emission inventory and ancillary files were based on the 2008 emissions modeling platform for 2008, 2009, and 2010 and on the 2011 emission modeling platform for 2011 and 2012. The fire emissions were based on year-specific daily fire estimates using the Hazard Mapping System fire detections and Sonoma Technology SMARTFIRE system (version 2) ([http://www.getbluesky.org/smartfire/docs/Raffuse 2007.pdf](http://www.getbluesky.org/smartfire/docs/Raffuse%202007.pdf)). Plume rise was calculated within the CMAQ model (in-line). Biogenic emissions were processed in-line in CMAQ and are based on the Biogenic Emissions Inventory System v3.14 (<http://www.cmascenter.org>).

CMAQ hourly output was averaged to 24 hours (midnight to midnight and adjusted for time zone) for each grid point. From the gridded output we calculated area weighted averages for daily and annual fire-PM_{2.5} daily averages for each county. We characterize smoke exposure impacts with respect to the magnitude of exposure, frequency of days with moderate air quality (15 -35 µg/m³) and frequency of days with unhealthy levels of fire-

190 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ ($>35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) according to 2006 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS. In terms of health risks, moderate air
191 quality days are interpreted as “Unhealthy for Unusually Sensitive Groups”; while
192 concentrations above 35.4 are interpreted as unhealthy for a broader population. More
193 specifically, 35.5-55.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ is considered “Unhealthy for Sensitive Individuals”, 55.5-
194 150.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ is considered “Unhealthy” for all individuals, 150.5-250.4 is “Very Unhealthy”,
195 and ≥ 250.5 is “Hazardous”³³. The two concentrations used in this analysis also correspond
196 to the annual (15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and daily (35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) 2006 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS. Here we used the 2006
197 standard because it was the standard of the time period 2008 to 2012. In December, 2012
198 the NAAQS for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ was revised, and the annual standard was reduced to 12 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ while
199 the daily standard 35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was retained. We note, that we use these thresholds to define
200 moderate and unhealthy smoke days and not to define compliance to air quality
201 regulations. Finally, to calculate population size at risk we used age and gender specific
202 population size from 2010 U.S. Census.

203 Wildfire perimeters for each year in this five-year period used in the study were obtained
204 from USGS Geospatial Multi-Agency Coordination Group (GeoMAC) Wildland Fire Support
205 archives. The GeoMAC is an interactive mapping application that displays maps of current
206 fire locations and perimeters in the 48 contiguous states plus Alaska. This tool gathers fire
207 data from daily incidence reports and defines wildland fire perimeters based on incident
208 intelligence sources, GPS data, fixed wing aircraft sources, and satellite data. Fires not
209 reported to the incidence intelligence such as prescribed and agricultural fires are not
210 represented in the GeoMAC. The shape files and metadata are available at
211 http://rmgsc.cr.usgs.gov/outgoing/GeoMAC/historic_fire_data/.

RESULTS

Fire-PM_{2.5} patterns over the continental U.S., 2008-2012

In Figure 1, we mapped a geographic distribution of the estimated fire-PM_{2.5} daily average with respect to: (a) the magnitude and (b) frequency of unhealthy smoke days. The maps of fire-PM_{2.5} were also overlaid with the geocoded perimeters of the large wildfires from GeoMAC archives. In combination with large fire parameters and with respect to the magnitude of impact, two distinct and large spatial footprints are observed for fire-PM_{2.5}. The first footprint was observed over the heavily forested, cold and temperate climates of Northern California and Pacific Northwest, where high concentrations were co-located with a dense distribution of fire perimeters. The second fire-PM_{2.5} footprint was observed across the Southeast where vegetation includes hardwood, pine and southern mixed forests, and wetlands. According to the National Emissions Inventory used in our CMAQ simulations, a majority of the emissions in this region are attributed to smaller and more localized wildland fires, which include agricultural burning and prescribed burning, and a large number of smaller fires. Prescribed burning is done on an annual basis in early months of the year and with the exception of drought years, the smoke footprint is consistently present from year to year. Daily 24-average fire-PM_{2.5} on smoke days was substantially lower in the Southeast than in the Northwestern states with the exception of days when large wildfires occurred (wildfire impacts can be observed from hourly concentrations which are not shown here). Maps for individual years are given in the Supplemental Materials Figures S1-S10.

Figure 1b demonstrates a notable difference between the Northwest and Southeast regions in frequency by which estimated county-averaged fire-PM_{2.5} was above the level considered “Unhealthy for Sensitive Individuals” (>35µg/m³). The largest impact was in the Northwest region where a number of communities experienced 10 or more days of high fire-PM_{2.5} levels. With the exception of Louisiana during winter 2008, the Southeast region had a significantly lower number of unhealthy fire-PM_{2.5} days. In summary, both footprints had a large number of moderate air quality days due to fire-PM_{2.5}, while days with fire-PM_{2.5} exceeding the level considered unhealthy for wider population were mostly in the Northwest region.

County Scale Health-Vulnerability and Smoke Impacts

The CHVI score ranged from 6 to 25, with a median score of 15, and 75th, 90th, and 95th percentile of 17, 19, and 20, respectively. The highest vulnerability is observed in the counties along the western slope of the Appalachian Mountains, parts of the Midwest (Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma and Kansas) and parts of the South (Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia) (Figure 2). Although none of the five indices dominated CHVI overall, the regions of the highest vulnerability tend to have high index values on multiple factors, particularly the prevalence of preexisting cardiovascular, metabolic diseases, and childhood asthma as well as economic deprivation.

Table 1 shows the estimated population size at risk by factors of vulnerability. We estimate that 30.5 million (13%) individuals, including 7.4 million children under 18, and 4 million persons over 65 years of age lived in communities where the annual average of fire-PM_{2.5}

was estimated to be above $1.5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (annual average). Among these communities, there were 7.4 million individuals over 30 years of age with known hypertension, 2 million adults with asthma and 0.7 million children with asthma, 1.3 million people with COPD, 7.0 million obese individuals, and 2.4 million individuals with diabetes. We note that population size at risk was calculated separately for each county level factor of vulnerability; thus individuals with co-morbidities are counted for each health outcome.

Table 2 shows the population size at risk by CHVI, annual mean fire- $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ levels, and frequency of moderate and unhealthy fire- $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ days. We estimate that 82.4 million individuals lived in counties with moderate air quality due to fire- $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ ($15 - 35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and 10.3 million individuals lived in the counties with unhealthy air quality levels ($>35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for more than 10 days between 2008 and 2012. Among the communities with the highest annual fire- $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ means ($>1.5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), 8.1 million (26.6%) lived in counties with vulnerability index below the median (CHVI 6-15) while 22.4 million lived in the counties with vulnerability above the median (73.4%, $36.1+24.6+7.4+5.3$; CHVI [15-24] combined) and 12.7% lived in the counties with high vulnerability ($7.4\%+5.3\%$; CHVI >19). In contrast, across the nation approximately half of population (51.4%) lived in counties where CHVI is below median and half (49.6%) lived in the counties where CHVI was above the median.

Over the time period considered, areas with the highest vulnerability were more likely to experience unhealthy levels of fire- $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ annual average ($1.5, 4.58$) than less vulnerable populations ($1.6/6.5 \times 100 = 25\%$ for CVHI [20,24] compared to $8.1/157.7 \times 100 = 5\%$ for CVHI [6,15]). Similar was true for number of days with moderate fire- $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ ($15 - 35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)

for 10+ days and for number of days with fire-PM_{2.5} above 35µg/m³ for 5+ days (Table 2). More specifically, among the counties with vulnerability index below the median, 25% (39.5/157.5*100%) of population lived in places that experienced an excess of 10 days of moderate air quality due to fire while among the counties with the highest vulnerability (CHVI 21-24), 41.5% (2.7/6.5*100%) of population experienced an excess of 10 days of moderate air quality due to fire. A substantially smaller population size was impacted by a large number of days with unhealthy air quality (>35 µg/m³); 10.7% of the population in the counties with CHVI below the median and 15.2% of the population in the most vulnerable counties experienced more than 5 days of unhealthy air quality (>35 µg/m³). However, 4.4% of the least vulnerable communities and only 2.1% of the most vulnerable communities were impacted by 10 or more days of fire-PM_{2.5} above 35 µg/m³.

289

290 **DISCUSSION**

291 In this study we constructed an index of population vulnerability to health impacts from
292 smoke exposure based on clinical and social factors known to modify the risk of adverse
293 health effects and estimated population size at risk with respect to the frequency and
294 magnitude of smoke exposure in a recent period. The modeling methods used in the study
295 estimate that between 2008 and 2012 population exposure to smoke in the continental U.S.
296 was extensive; 29.7% of the population lived in areas with moderate exposure (annual
297 average fire-PM_{2.5} between 0.75 and 1.5µg/m³) and another 10% lived in areas where the
298 contribution to annual ambient PM_{2.5} was high (>1.5 µg/m³). We identified the most
299 vulnerable U.S. counties and determined that vulnerable communities were more likely to

experience high and frequent smoke exposure in comparison to less vulnerable populations. The findings described in the study have potential implications for efficient and effective allocation of limited resources for dissemination of public health messaging, and land and fuel management to prevent large wildfires.

The constructed Community Health-Vulnerability Index incorporates disease prevalence, age and socio-economic status of individuals in the community. The specific factors were chosen based on published literature that demonstrates their role as risk factors for cardio-respiratory effects of particles or wildfire smoke. Published research describes multiple biological mechanisms by which air pollution causes cardio-respiratory effects including oxidative stress, pulmonary and systemic inflammation, activation of pulmonary nociceptive receptors, and modulation of the autonomic nervous system (Brook et al. 2010). Therefore, individuals having chronic health conditions characterized in part by pro-inflammatory states (e.g. asthma, COPD, diabetes, cardiovascular disease) are considered at higher risk³⁴. Among the risk factors, preexisting cardiovascular disease is one of the leading factors of increased health risks to air pollution effects³⁵. We used hypertension to approximate prevalence of cardiovascular disease because it is well documented, the most prevalent cardiovascular condition, and is responsible for one in six deaths among adults. Chronic metabolic and inflammatory health conditions such as diabetes and obesity have been shown to increase the risk to air pollution impacts³⁶⁻³⁸. Children are considered more sensitive to impacts of air pollution because their lungs are smaller, and their dose per body weight and lung surface areas exceed those of the adult population.

322 The majority of evidence for wildfire smoke effects are based on studies of exposure to
323 ambient air pollution ¹³ but there is also a growing number of fire-PM_{2.5} studies that
324 suggest consistency between respiratory effects within fire specific studies and in
325 comparison to studies of urban air pollution ^{9, 39}. The effects of air pollution and wildfire
326 smoke exposure on adults with preexisting respiratory conditions such as asthma and
327 COPD are extensively documented in literature. These effects have also been noted in both
328 children with asthma and children without asthma ^{5, 40} and have been noted to be stronger
329 than in adults ⁴¹. Additionally, older adults have been shown to have an increased risk of
330 cardiovascular and respiratory effects in fire-PM_{2.5} exposure studies ^{3, 7, 42, 43}. Apart from
331 the clinical characteristics discussed, low socioeconomic status has also been reported to
332 modify the risk of respiratory outcomes in response to large wildland fire smoke events ³⁰.
333 We have previously shown that when considering external factors influencing health
334 (health behaviors, access and quality of clinical care, social and economic factors, and the
335 physical environments) socio-economic factors are strong contributors of differences in
336 risk for asthma and congestive heart failure resulting from exposure to wildfire smoke ²⁹.
337 In the development of the health-vulnerability index we restrict our attention to the key
338 clinical and social conditions that have been identified by the Integrated Science
339 Assessment as populations sensitive to adverse health effects following air pollution
340 exposure. It is clear however, that these are not the only risk factors involved at the
341 individual level. Evidence for a role for genetics, epigenetics, diet, availability of green
342 space and behavior is emerging and it is likely that some of these will ultimately prove to
343 be strong predictors of PM_{2.5} associated health outcomes. As new risk factors are identified
344 the CHVI can be adapted to incorporate the new information. Additionally, a number of

other extrinsic factors have been shown to identify social vulnerability to environmental hazards such as heat waves, including occupation, employment, housing, built environment, neighborhood deprivation, poor English skills and are likely to apply in wildfire smoke situations ⁴⁴⁻⁴⁷. When constructing indicators at the regional, state or local levels, and particularly when considering decision making, it may be helpful and advantageous to incorporate determinants of social vulnerability along with the indicators of health vulnerability (e.g. built environment, landscape, social and physical connectivity, existing air quality, etc) and examine sensitivity of the indicators.

Implications for Public Health Actions

Interventions and health-promoting behaviors can improve public health outcomes ^{48, 49}. Many of the recommended measures including staying indoors during very unhealthy air quality days, running air conditioning on recirculation mode, creating a clean room, ensuring a supply of regular medication, etc. can reduce personal exposure and decrease the health risks. However, during wildfire episodes, individuals do not perceive risks to their health and become aware of them once smoke exposure is already occurring, when it may be too late to take many of the recommended preventative measures. Smoke impacts in the areas where wildfires are less common (eg. Southeast) can be a special concern exactly because they are less frequent and the health risk awareness is not established at the individual or community level. Prior knowledge about community health vulnerability can help guide deliberate awareness building and outreach among the most sensitive populations. However, identifying communities at the greatest risk from wildfire smoke is currently based solely on the predicted risk of fire and we do not consider the composition

of the communities. As such public health messaging and actions may not be appropriately scaled to communities with high numbers of sensitive individuals.

Increased frequency of large wildland fires is anticipated to continue and have effects on human health and environment⁵⁰⁻⁵². Fuel management activities, such as prescribed burning, are a critically important component of the national strategy to improve ecological diversity and decrease wildfires harmful to human health and have been examined with respect to changes in frequency and area burned⁵³⁻⁵⁶. While such information provides important insights for a broad risk-based management system for wildfire, the framework does not consider the potential public health burden of smoke emissions or disparities in sensitivity of the populations affected. Projecting community health-vulnerability under different fire mitigation strategies, climate change scenarios, and population growth projections may offer further refinement of such risk-based management approaches. In projecting community health-vulnerability for a specific future scenario we recommend using population-weighted exposures.

Limitations of the Study

We note some limitations to our analysis. To estimate smoke exposure at the national level we use CMAQ model simulated with and without fires and attribute the difference in estimated ambient PM_{2.5} concentrations to large fires (mostly wild and prescribed). To assess model performance, we matched CMAQ grid locations to the locations of environmental monitors and compare predicted and observed values. We found the model has a high bias at low PM_{2.5} concentrations suggesting that: (1) plumes are too dispersive,

and/or (2) small fires have too high emissions in the simulation. The model also over predicts $PM_{2.5}$ (mainly OC, EC) during all seasons for fire events. Another limitation is that only fire events that are part of the emission inventory have been evaluated. Any misspecification of emissions in the inventory is not included in our analysis. An important limitation to our simulation of fire- $PM_{2.5}$ that affects air quality is that our modeling system does not simulate the smoldering aspects of peat fires well which are common in the Southeast and emit large quantities of particles and gasses. We note that as with all models CMAQ results should be interpreted with caution because any combination of these factors could lead to uncertainty and over or under prediction of estimated exposures. While various aspects of CMAQ performance have been published in the literature ⁵⁷, additional factors could play role in the uncertainty specific to fire- $PM_{2.5}$.

Another limitation is the assumption that $PM_{2.5}$ from all sources is equally harmful to health. The composition and toxicity of these particles varies with respect to the type of fuel burned, conditions of burning and the age of the particles. Lower combustion efficiency yields more volatile and organic compound in both particles and gases (polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, oxygenated organics, and various gases) which are harmful to human health. Toxicological studies also indicate that relative toxicity of particles varies when examined per unit mass or total mass, and by chemical composition of the particles. Fire- $PM_{2.5}$ and fire- PM_{10} collected during a peat fire in eastern North Carolina in 2008 had very different targets of cellular toxicity that depended on the particle mass of the smoke particles and the phase of the fire ⁵⁸. Cardiovascular toxicity was the dominant effect caused by ultrafine PM fraction collected during the active smoldering phase of the fire while in vitro pulmonary inflammatory responses were the dominant

effects of coarse fraction of PM. Smoldering fires, as seen in the peat fires across Southeast U.S., Indonesia, and Boreal forest have also been hypothesized to carry higher risk for cardiovascular Emergency Department visits as well ^{11, 43}. This could be due to lower combustion efficiency and vegetation type that define chemical composition of particles, such as the abundance polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons which are carcinogenic and particularly harmful to health ⁵⁹. However, a systematic review of published literature suggests that there is no consistent relationship that identifies specific PM_{2.5} components that may be unequivocally related to health outcomes ⁶⁰.

The most significant limitation to this assessment of human vulnerability to health impacts of smoke is the lack of a good measure of a community's ability to adapt. While the factors that define the vulnerability status certainly play role, other less quantifiable measures including awareness, previous experience, outreach programs, engagement of public health, and proximity to health care providers or facilities which can define human responses. Gaither et al. 2011 examined spatial association between fire prone areas in the Southeast and socially vulnerable 'hot spots' using proximity to wildland fire mitigation programs as a measure of community's ability to adopt. However, we did not find equivalent measures of community responses specific to health responses.

Wildland fires have been an integral part of human history with clear benefit to the management of fire hazards and to the ecologic diversity of ecosystems. However, recent trends in very large wildfires, termed mega fires, have brought attention to the adverse health effects of smoke exposure, the high cost of wildfire suppression and management,

and the need to establish community-based adaptation plans. Employing the same methodology used to determine social vulnerability to environmental hazards²³, we provide a concept of mapping the vulnerability to health outcomes specific to smoke exposure. Such maps can be helpful tools for public officials in preparation of smoke adaptation plans for their communities and prioritization of communities for allocation of resources by the local, state and federal governments. In the U.S. there are over 70,000 wildfires annually, impacting communities and regional air quality with varying frequency and intensity and thus representing a challenge to building community resilience with respect to fire smoke and public health guidance. Therefore, as a proof of concept, the Community Health-Vulnerability Index offers a tool to help identify communities that have the potential to benefit the most from mitigation strategies to minimize smoke exposure for sensitive populations and to decrease the health and economic burden imposed on the population by fire-PM_{2.5}. The next step could include tailoring messages to community needs and development of exposure mitigation strategies.

Funding:

The research described in this article has been funded wholly by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency intramural research funding.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Supporting Information Available: The Supporting Information material includes the list of data sources (Table S1), figures of the annual average daily fire-PM_{2.5} footprint by year (Figures S1-S5), figures of number of days with fire-PM_{2.5} above 35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (Figures S6-S10) and details of principal components analysis output (Table S2, Figure S11).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank four anonymous reviewers, Pete Lahm (USFS), Jason Sacks (US EPA), Christina Baghdikian (US EPA), Ann Brown (US EPA) for their comments and careful review of the manuscript.

TABLES

Table 1. Population size at risk summarized by annual average fire-PM_{2.5} (2008-2012). We used outcome specific prevalence rates by county. Population size is given in millions.

PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³)	Adult Asthma	Pediatric Asthma	COPD	Hyper- tensive	Diabetes	Obesity	Poverty	Under 18	65 and Over	Total Population
	20.8	6.4	11.8	68.8	20.3	60.9	42.5	73.7	40.0	306.7
(0,0.15]	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.4	2.8
(0.15,0.75]	12.7	3.8	6.6	40.0	11.3	34.4	23.6	43.5	23.7	182.2
(0.75,1.5]	5.9	1.9	3.8	20.8	6.4	19.0	13.2	22.2	11.9	91.1
(1.5,4.58]	2.0	0.7	1.3	7.4	2.4	7.0	5.3	7.4	4.0	30.5

Table 2. Population size at risk by Community Health-Vulnerability Index, annual mean fire-PM_{2.5}, and frequency of unhealthy fire-PM_{2.5} days between 2008 and 2012. Population size is given in millions (# % expressed conditional on the population in the right margin, * expressed as % of the total population).

CHVI Bins		[6,15]	(15,17]	(17,19]	(19,20]	(20,24]	Total
Annual Mean ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	[0,0.15]	2 (72.3%)	0.7 (25.2%)	0.1 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2.8 (0.9%)
	(0.15,0.75]	98.6 (54.1%)	61.4 (33.7%)	13.5 (7.4%)	5.6 (3.1%)	3.1 (1.7%)	182.2 (59.4%)
	(0.75,1.5]	49 (53.8%)	25.4 (27.8%)	12.3 (13.5%)	2.7 (3%)	1.8 (2%)	91.2 (29.7%)
	(1.5,4.58]	8.1 (26.6%)	11 (36.1%)	7.5 (24.6%)	2.3 (7.4%)	1.6 (5.3%)	30.5 (9.9%)
Num. Days with 15-35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	[1,5)	69.6 (63.1%)	29.9 (27.1%)	8 (7.3%)	2.1 (1.9%)	0.7 (0.6%)	110.4 (36%)
	[5,10)	16.6 (31.2%)	23.5 (44.2%)	8.8 (16.6%)	2.1 (4%)	2.1 (4%)	53.1 (17.3%)
	[10,76]	39.5 (47.9%)	22.9 (27.8%)	13.6 (16.4%)	3.8 (4.6%)	2.7 (3.3%)	82.4 (26.9%)
Num. Days with >35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	[1,5)	28.5 (49%)	14.4 (24.7%)	11 (18.9%)	2.8 (4.9%)	1.4 (2.5%)	58.2 (19%)
	[5,10)	9.9 (51.6%)	5.4 (28.2%)	2.2 (11.7%)	0.8 (4%)	0.9 (4.5%)	19.1 (6.2%)
	[10,55]	6.9 (67%)	2.8 (27.1%)	0.3 (2.9%)	0.2 (1.6%)	0.1 (1.3%)	10.3 (3.4%)
Total		157.7 (51.4%)	98.5 (32.1%)	33.4 (10.9%)	10.6 (3.5%)	6.5 (2.1%)	306.7 (100%)

FIGURES

Figure 1a) Annual average daily fire-PM_{2.5} footprint by counties of continental US and perimeters of area burned by large fires in black (GeoMAC) between 2008 and 2012.






Figure 1b) Number of days with fire-PM_{2.5} above 35 µg/m³ by counties of continental US and perimeters of area burned by large fires in black (GeoMAC) between 2008 and 2012.

Figure 1b



488

Figure 2. National map of the Community health-vulnerability Index (CHVI). The break points 15, 17, 19, and 20 correspond to the 50th, 75th, 90th, and 95th percentile of CHVI scores respectively.



REFERENCES

1. Dennekamp, M.; Abramson, M. J., The effects of bushfire smoke on respiratory health. *Respirology* **2011**, *16*, (2), 198-209.

2. Dennekamp, M.; Straney, L. D.; Erbas, B.; Abramson, M. J.; Keywood, M.; Smith, K.; Sim, M. R.; Glass, D. C.; Del Monaco, A.; Haikerwal, A.; Tonkin, A. M., Forest Fire Smoke Exposures and Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrests in Melbourne, Australia: A Case-Crossover Study. *Environ Health Perspect* **2015**, *123*, (10), 959-64.

3. Haikerwal, A.; Akram, M.; Del Monaco, A.; Smith, K.; Sim, M. R.; Meyer, M.; Tonkin, A. M.; Abramson, M. J.; Dennekamp, M., Impact of Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) Exposure During Wildfires on Cardiovascular Health Outcomes. *Journal of the American Heart Association* **2015**, *4*, (7).

4. Haikerwal, A.; Akram, M.; Sim, M. R.; Meyer, M.; Abramson, M. J.; Dennekamp, M., Fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) exposure during a prolonged wildfire period and emergency department visits for asthma. *Respirology* **2016**, *21*, (1), 88-94.

5. Jalaludin, B.; Smith, M.; O'Toole, B.; Leeder, S., Acute effects of bushfires on peak expiratory flow rates in children with wheeze: a time series analysis. *Aust N Z J Public Health* **2000**, *24*, (2), 174-7.

- 511 6. Johnston, F. H.; Henderson, S. B.; Chen, Y.; Randerson, J. T.; Marlier, M.; Defries, R. S.; Kinney,
512 P.; Bowman, D. M.; Brauer, M., Estimated global mortality attributable to smoke from landscape
513 fires. *Environ Health Perspect* **2012**, *120*, (5), 695-701.
- 514 7. Johnston, F. H.; Purdie, S.; Jalaludin, B.; Martin, K. L.; Henderson, S. B.; Morgan, G. G., Air
515 pollution events from forest fires and emergency department attendances in Sydney, Australia
516 1996-2007: a case-crossover analysis. *Environ Health* **2014**, *13*, 105.
- 517 8. Kunzli, N.; Avol, E.; Wu, J.; Gauderman, W. J.; Rappaport, E.; Millstein, J.; Bennion, J.;
518 McConnell, R.; Gilliland, F. D.; Berhane, K., Health effects of the 2003 Southern California wildfires
519 on children. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine* **2006**, *174*, (11), 1221-1228.
- 520 9. Liu, J. C.; Pereira, G.; Uhl, S. A.; Bravo, M. A.; Bell, M. L., A systematic review of the physical
521 health impacts from non-occupational exposure to wildfire smoke. *Environmental research* **2015**,
522 *136*, 120-132.
- 523 10. Morgan, G.; Sheppard, V.; Khalaj, B.; Ayyar, A.; Lincoln, D.; Jalaludin, B.; Beard, J.; Corbett, S.;
524 Lumley, T., Effects of bushfire smoke on daily mortality and hospital admissions in Sydney,
525 Australia. *Epidemiology* **2010**, *21*, (1), 47-55.
- 526 11. Rappold, A. G.; Stone, S. L.; Cascio, W. E.; Neas, L. M.; Kilaru, V. J.; Carraway, M. S.; Szykman, J.
527 J.; Ising, A.; Cleve, W. E.; Meredith, J. T.; Vaughan-Batten, H.; Deyneka, L.; Devlin, R. B., Peat bog
528 wildfire smoke exposure in rural North Carolina is associated with cardiopulmonary emergency
529 department visits assessed through syndromic surveillance. *Environ Health Perspect* **2011**, *119*,
530 (10), 1415-20.
- 531 12. Delfino, R. J.; Brummel, S.; Wu, J.; Stern, H.; Ostro, B.; Lipsett, M.; Winer, A.; Street, D. H.;
532 Zhang, L.; Tjoa, T., The relationship of respiratory and cardiovascular hospital admissions to the
533 southern California wildfires of 2003. *Occupational and environmental medicine* **2008**.
- 534 13. US EPA, Integrated Science Assessment (ISA) for Particulate Matter (Final). In U.S.
535 Environmental Protection Agency: Washington, D.C., 2009.
- 536 14. Bell, M. L.; Zanobetti, A.; Dominici, F., Evidence on vulnerability and susceptibility to health
537 risks associated with short-term exposure to particulate matter: a systematic review and meta-
538 analysis. *Am J Epidemiol* **2013**, *178*, (6), 865-76.
- 539 15. Sacks, J. D.; Stanek, L. W.; Luben, T. J.; Johns, D. O.; Buckley, B. J.; Brown, J. S.; Ross, M.,
540 Particulate matter-induced health effects: who is susceptible? *Environ Health Perspect* **2011**, *119*,
541 (4), 446-54.
- 542 16. Reid, C. E.; O'Neill, M. S.; Gronlund, C. J.; Brines, S. J.; Brown, D. G.; Diez-Roux, A. V.; Schwartz,
543 J., Mapping community determinants of heat vulnerability. *Environmental health perspectives* **2009**,
544 *117*, (11), 1730.
- 545 17. Blaikie, P.; Cannon, T.; Davis, I.; Wisner, B., *At risk: natural hazards, people's vulnerability and*
546 *disasters*. Routledge: 2014.
- 547 18. Cutter, S. L.; Mitchell, J. T.; Scott, M. S., Revealing the vulnerability of people and places: a
548 case study of Georgetown County, South Carolina. *Annals of the association of American Geographers*
549 **2000**, *90*, (4), 713-737.
- 550 19. Wu, S.-Y.; Yarnal, B.; Fisher, A., Vulnerability of coastal communities to sea-level rise: a case
551 study of Cape May County, New Jersey, USA. *Climate Research* **2002**, *22*, (3), 255-270.
- 552 20. Morrow, B. H., Identifying and mapping community vulnerability. *Disasters* **1999**, *23*, (1), 1-
553 18.
- 554 21. Clougherty, J. E.; Kubzansky, L. D., A framework for examining social stress and
555 susceptibility to air pollution in respiratory health. *Environ Health Perspect* **2009**, *117*, (9), 1351-8.
- 556 22. Bradford, K.; Abrahams, L.; Hegglin, M.; Klima, K., A Heat Vulnerability Index and Adaptation
557 Solutions for Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. *Environ Sci Technol* **2015**, *49*, (19), 11303-11.
- 558 23. Cutter, S. L.; Boruff, B. J.; Shirley, W. L., Social vulnerability to environmental hazards. *Social*
559 *science quarterly* **2003**, *84*, (2), 242-261.
- 560 24. American Lung Association, State of the Air 2015. www.stateoftheair.org, 2015.

- 561 25. Bateson, T. F.; Schwartz, J., Who is sensitive to the effects of particulate air pollution on
562 mortality?: a case-crossover analysis of effect modifiers. *Epidemiology* **2004**, *15*, (2), 143-149.
- 563 26. American Lung Association, Estimated Prevalence and Incidence of Lung Disease. **2014**.
- 564 27. US CDC 2012 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). Available at:
565 <ftp://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Data/Brfss/userguide.pdf>.
- 566 28. Olives, C.; Myerson, R.; Mokdad, A. H.; Murray, C. J.; Lim, S. S., Prevalence, awareness,
567 treatment, and control of hypertension in United States counties, 2001-2009. *PLoS One* **2013**, *8*, (4),
568 e60308.
- 569 29. Rappold, A. G.; Cascio, W. E.; Kilaru, V. J.; Stone, S. L.; Neas, L. M.; Devlin, R. B.; Diaz-Sanchez,
570 D., Cardio-respiratory outcomes associated with exposure to wildfire smoke are modified by
571 measures of community health. *Environmental Health* **2012**, *11*, (1), 1.
- 572 30. Reid, C. E.; Jerrett, M.; Tager, I. B.; Petersen, M. L.; Mann, J. K.; Balmes, J. R., Differential
573 respiratory health effects from the 2008 northern California wildfires: A spatiotemporal approach.
574 *Environmental Research* **2016**, *150*, 227-235.
- 575 31. Census, US Census Bureau. Available:
576 https://www2.census.gov/geo/tiger/TIGER2010DP1/County_2010Census_DP1.zip. **2010**.
- 577 32. Yarwood G., R. S. T., Yocke M., Whitten G.Z., Updates to the Carbon Bond Mechanism: CB05.
578 *US EPA* **2005**, *Final Report*.
- 579 33. US EPA, Technical Assistance Document for the Reporting of Daily Air Quality- the Air
580 Quality Index (AQI). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and
581 Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC, 2013; Vol. EPA-454/B-13-001.
- 582 34. Zanobetti, A.; Bind, M.-A. C.; Schwartz, J., Particulate air pollution and survival in a COPD
583 cohort. *Environmental Health* **2008**, *7*, (1), 1.
- 584 35. Brook, R. D.; Rajagopalan, S.; Pope, C. A.; Brook, J. R.; Bhatnagar, A.; Diez-Roux, A. V.; Holguin,
585 F.; Hong, Y.; Luepker, R. V.; Mittleman, M. A., Particulate matter air pollution and cardiovascular
586 disease an update to the scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*
587 **2010**, *121*, (21), 2331-2378.
- 588 36. Devlin, R. B.; Smith, C. B.; Schmitt, M. T.; Rappold, A. G.; Hinderliter, A.; Graff, D.; Carraway,
589 M. S., Controlled exposure of humans with metabolic syndrome to concentrated ultrafine ambient
590 particulate matter causes cardiovascular effects. *Toxicol Sci* **2014**, *140*, (1), 61-72.
- 591 37. Ruckerl, R.; Hampel, R.; Breitner, S.; Cyrys, J.; Kraus, U.; Carter, J.; Dailey, L.; Devlin, R. B.;
592 Diaz-Sanchez, D.; Koenig, W.; Phipps, R.; Silbajoris, R.; Soentgen, J.; Soukup, J.; Peters, A.; Schneider,
593 A., Associations between ambient air pollution and blood markers of inflammation and
594 coagulation/fibrinolysis in susceptible populations. *Environ Int* **2014**, *70*, 32-49.
- 595 38. Schneider, A.; Neas, L.; Herbst, M. C.; Case, M.; Williams, R. W.; Cascio, W.; Hinderliter, A.;
596 Holguin, F.; Buse, J. B.; Dungan, K., Endothelial dysfunction: associations with exposure to ambient
597 fine particles in diabetic individuals. *Environmental health perspectives* **2008**, *116*, (12), 1666.
- 598 39. Reid, C. E.; Brauer, M.; Johnston, F.; Jerrett, M.; Balmes, J. R.; Elliott, C. T., Critical Review of
599 Health Impacts of Wildfire Smoke Exposure. *Environmental health perspectives* **2016**.
- 600 40. Kunzli, N.; Avol, E.; Wu, J.; Gauderman, W. J.; Rappaport, E.; Millstein, J.; Bennion, J.;
601 McConnell, R.; Gilliland, F. D.; Berhane, K.; Lurmann, F.; Winer, A.; Peters, J. M., Health effects of the
602 2003 Southern California wildfires on children. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **2006**, *174*, (11), 1221-8.
- 603 41. Ignotti, E.; Valente, J. G.; Longo, K. M.; Freitas, S. R.; Hacon, S. d. S.; Artaxo Netto, P., Impact on
604 human health of particulate matter emitted from burnings in the Brazilian Amazon region. *Revista*
605 *de saude publica* **2010**, *44*, (1), 121-130.
- 606 42. Morgan, G.; Corbett, S.; Wlodarczyk, J., Air pollution and hospital admissions in Sydney,
607 Australia, 1990 to 1994. *Am J Public Health* **1998**, *88*, (12), 1761-6.

43. Tinling, M. A.; West, J. J.; Cascio, W. E.; Kilaru, V.; Rappold, A. G., Repeating cardiopulmonary health effects in rural North Carolina population during a second large peat wildfire. *Environ Health* **2016**, *15*, 12.
44. Harlan, S. L.; Declet-Barreto, J. H.; Stefanov, W. L.; Petitti, D. B., Neighborhood effects on heat deaths: social and environmental predictors of vulnerability in Maricopa County, Arizona. *Environ Health Perspect* **2013**, *121*, (2), 197-204.
45. Messer, L. C.; Laraia, B. A.; Kaufman, J. S.; Eyster, J.; Holzman, C.; Culhane, J.; Elo, I.; Burke, J. G.; O'Campo, P., The development of a standardized neighborhood deprivation index. *J Urban Health* **2006**, *83*, (6), 1041-62.
46. Petitti, D. B.; Harlan, S. L.; Chowell-Puente, G.; Ruddell, D., Occupation and environmental heat-associated deaths in Maricopa county, Arizona: a case-control study. *PLoS One* **2013**, *8*, (5), e62596.
47. Uejio, C. K.; Wilhelmi, O. V.; Golden, J. S.; Mills, D. M.; Gulino, S. P.; Samenow, J. P., Intra-urban societal vulnerability to extreme heat: the role of heat exposure and the built environment, socioeconomics, and neighborhood stability. *Health Place* **2011**, *17*, (2), 498-507.
48. Neidell, M., Air quality warnings and outdoor activities: evidence from Southern California using a regression discontinuity design. *J Epidemiol Community Health* **2010**, *64*, (10), 921-6.
49. Mott, J. A.; Meyer, P.; Mannino, D.; Redd, S. C.; Smith, E. M.; Gotway-Crawford, C.; Chase, E., Wildland forest fire smoke: health effects and intervention evaluation, Hoopa, California, 1999. *West J Med* **2002**, *176*, (3), 157-62.
50. Kinney, P. L., Climate change, air quality, and human health. *Am J Prev Med* **2008**, *35*, (5), 459-67.
51. Fann, N.; Fulcher, C. M.; Baker, K., The recent and future health burden of air pollution apportioned across U.S. sectors. *Environ Sci Technol* **2013**, *47*, (8), 3580-9.
52. Liu, J. C.; Mickley, L. J.; Sulprizio, M. P.; Yue, X.; Peng, R. D.; Dominici, F.; Michelle L Bell, D., Future respiratory hospital admissions from wildfire smoke under climate change in the Western US. *Environmental Research Letters* **2016**, *11*, (12), 124018.
53. Prestemon, J.; Shankar, U.; Xiu, A.; Talgo, K.; Yang, D.; Dixon IV, E.; McKenzie, D.; Abt, K. L., Projecting wildfire area burned in the south-eastern United States, 2011-60. **2016**.
54. Flannigan, M. D.; Van Wagner, C. E., Climate Change and wildfire in Canada. *Can. J. For. Res.* **1991**, *21*, 66-72.
55. Bowman, D. M.; Balch, J. K.; Artaxo, P.; Bond, W. J.; Carlson, J. M.; Cochrane, M. A.; D'Antonio, C. M.; Defries, R. S.; Doyle, J. C.; Harrison, S. P.; Johnston, F. H.; Keeley, J. E.; Krawchuk, M. A.; Kull, C. A.; Marston, J. B.; Moritz, M. A.; Prentice, I. C.; Roos, C. I.; Scott, A. C.; Swetnam, T. W.; van der Werf, G. R.; Pyne, S. J., Fire in the Earth system. *Science* **2009**, *324*, (5926), 481-4.
56. Ager, A. A.; Day, M. A.; McHugh, C. W.; Short, K.; Gilbertson-Day, J.; Finney, M. A.; Calkin, D. E., Wildfire exposure and fuel management on western US national forests. *Journal of Environmental Management* **2014**, *145*, (1), 54-70.
57. Park, S.-K.; Cobb, C. E.; Wade, K.; Mulholland, J.; Hu, Y.; Russe, A. G., Uncertainty in air quality model evaluation for particulate matter due to spatial variations in pollutant concentrations. *Atmospheric Environment* **2006**, *40*, Supplement 2, 563 - 573.
58. Kim, Y. H.; Tong, H.; Daniels, M.; Boykin, E.; Krantz, Q. T.; McGee, J.; Hays, M.; Kovalcik, K.; Dye, J. A.; Gilmour, M. I., Cardiopulmonary toxicity of peat wildfire particulate matter and the predictive utility of precision cut lung slices. *Part Fibre Toxicol* **2014**, *11*, 29.
59. IARC OUTDOOR AIR POLLUTION; World Health Organization: International Agency for Research on Cancer, 2016.
60. Stanek, L. W. S., Jason D. ; Dutton, Steven J.; Dubois, Jean-Jacques B. , Attributing health effects to apportioned components and sources of particulate matter: An evaluation of collective results. *Atmospheric Environment* **2011**, *45*, (October), 5655-5663.

657

